

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/801,798	03/17/2004	Kyoko Izuha	04329.3271	1896
22852	7590 06/08/2006		EXAM	INER
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER			WHITMORE, STACY	
LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			2825	
			DATE MAILED: 06/08/200	6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/801,798	IZUHA ET AL.
Offic Action Summ ry	Examiner	Art Unit
	Stacy A. Whitmore	2825
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet with	th the correspondence address
	DIVIC SET TO EVOIDE AM	ONTUKEN OF THIRTY (20) DAVE
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the maximum date of the maximum statutory. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re- riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON atute, cause the application to become AB,	CATION. eply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1:	1 May 2006.	
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ T	This action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allo	wance except for formal matte	ers, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice unde	er Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are pending in the applicati	ion.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) 2,4,6,8,10,12,14 a		om consideration.
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,3,5,7,9,11,13 and 15</u> is/are rejec	eted.	
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction an	d/or election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner.	
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 17 March 2004 is/arc		ected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to t	the drawing(s) be held in abeyan	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr	rection is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore	eign priority under 35 U.S.C. &	119(a)-(d) or (f).
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:	0 , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
1. Certified copies of the priority docume	ents have been received.	
2. Certified copies of the priority docume		oplication No
3. Copies of the certified copies of the p	priority documents have been	received in this National Stage
application from the International Bur	eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	list of the certified copies not r	received.
Attachment(s)		
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		ummary (PTO-413))/Mail Date
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/17/2004</u>. 		formal Patent Application (PTO-152)

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group I, claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, and 15 in the reply filed on May 11, 2006 is acknowledged.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 3 is objected to because of the following informalities: The claim term "Foulier" is an apparently misspelled word. The word should be "Fourier". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112: The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

- 3. Claims 1, 3, 7, 9, 11, 13, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- In claims 1 and 15, lines 3-4, the limitation "which is predicted from a design pattern" is unclear. It is unclear which pattern is being referred to, the desired or the finish pattern. Applicant is requested to clarify the claim language.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Application/Control Number: 10/801,798

Art Unit: 2825

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Page 3

- 4. Claims 1, 11, 13, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chang (US Patent 6,470,489).
- 5. As for the claims, Chang discloses the invention as claimed, including:

An edge deviation calculation method in which a desired pattern is compared with a finish pattern to be formed on a wafer, which is predicted from a design pattern, based on a calculation of a light beam intensity, and a deviation quantity of the finish pattern from the desired pattern at each of edges of the finish pattern and the desired pattern is calculated, the calculation method comprising:

setting a reference light beam intensity for setting the desired pattern on a wafer [abstract; figs. 12, 21-23; and col. 4 – col. 5, line 27];

setting an evaluation point for the finish pattern with the desired comparison of pattern [abstract; figs. 12, 21-23; and col. 4 – col. 5, line 27];

calculating a light beam intensity at the evaluation point [abstract; figs. 12, 21-23; and col. 4 – col. 5, line 27];

calculating a differentiation value of the light beam intensity at the evaluation point [abstract; figs. 12, 21-23; and col. 4 – col. 5, line 27];

calculating an intersection of the differentiation value with the reference light beam intensity [abstract; figs. 12, 21-23; and col. 4 – col. 5, line 27]; and

calculating a difference between the intersection and the evaluation point [abstract; figs. 12, 21-23; and col. 4 – col. 5, line 27];

wherein the difference is defined as an edge deviation quantity of the finish pattern from the desired pattern [abstract; figs. 12, 21-23; and col. 4 – col. 5, line 27];

Application/Control Number: 10/801,798

Art Unit: 2825

changing at least one of the reference light beam intensity and focus within each of determined ranges, and comparing the mask pattern with the finish pattern [abstract; figs. 12, 21-23; and col. 4 – col. 5, line 27];

Page 4

wherein the design pattern is a corrected pattern corrected to provide the desired pattern [abstract; figs. 12, 21-23; and col. 4 – col. 5, line 27];

verifying the edge deviation quantity [abstract; figs. 12, 21-23; and col. 4 – col. 5, line 27];

wherein, in the case where the edge deviation quantity exceeds an allowable range, the design pattern is corrected based on the deviation quantity [abstract; figs. 12, 21-23; and col. 4 - col. 5, line 27].

Allowable Subject Matter

- 6. Claims 3, 5, 7, and 9 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 7. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art of record fails to disclose either singularly or in combination the invention as claimed, including the method of edge deviation calculation comprising at least the calculating steps of claim 3; the calculating step of claim 5; the n-story differentiation of a light beam intensity comprising the polynomial of claim 7; and the n-story differentiation of a light beam intensity comprising the polynomial and Taylor expansion of claim 9.
- 8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stacy A. Whitmore whose telephone number is (571) 272-1685. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, alternate Friday 6:30am 4:00 pm.

Application/Control Number: 10/801,798

Art Unit: 2825

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Chiang can be reached on (571) 272-7483. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Stacy A Whitmore

Page 5

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2825

SAW

May 27, 2006